

part of town and for valuation purposes it is only valued at 40,000 and that is the disqualifier, the 40,000 under Senator Labedz's bill. So you can have the house...it's valued at 40,000. You can have it rented out to six...eight people, all of them with tremendous incomes, and even though you know if they are all participating, say it's a communal operation, and only one person, the person whose house its name is in, if it is a communal operation could be 65 years or older. But everyone in this communal situation contributes to the household, the payments. It's a communal situation. And so, therefore, collectively you could have an income of \$200,000, you know, or more or less, but the fact is that, you know, this family that is participating, the people whose names the house is in, they can get a hundred percent exemption on their home, and that is not the intention of the homestead exemption. That is not the intention of any of these proposals, but that is just the opposite of what Senator Labedz is saying. So what we say in this situation is simply this. If you have that kind of an income situation, you have to have a formal rental situation so that six people there are, in fact, renting their portions of the house and if that house is held in the 65 or older person's name, then they have to count that as income, and that is exactly what these other qualifications do. Now, Senator Labedz construes the bill to be a little differently than that and I can appreciate that, but I think the clarification is absolutely necessary. The homestead exemption should, in fact, be for those people who need it, not for those people that want it, and therein lies the tremendous distinction that this Legislature has to keep in mind. Homestead is for those who need help, those who want to stay in their homes and the state because of its policy is determined that we ought to help them stay in those homes. It should not be anybody who wants to avoid paying taxes who happen to be over 65 years of age, and therein is the reason why we have asked that other kinds of incomes be looked at, other kinds of incomes be counted so that, in fact, we have....so that, in fact, we have a homestead exemption based on need, not greed, but need. Now, I, too, oppose the committee amendments because they were poorly drafted....not poorly drafted but we didn't think them out and they are going to cost too much. But I think the distinctions that Senator Labedz makes are incorrect and I needed very desperately to set the record straight.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator DeCamp, do you wish to speak to the committee amendments?

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President, just to alert the body on behalf of yourself and myself and Senator Lewis and Senator